## REMARKS

As an initial matter, Applicants acknowledge with thanks the Examiner's indication that Claims 7, 19-20 and 26 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that at least one of $X_1$ to $X_8$ in formula I is OH. Support for this amendment can be found throughout of the original disclosure, especially in the Specification at pages 11-12 and the Examples. Thus, no new matter is added by this amendment.

Claims 2, 14-15 and 21-22 are amended to recite the invention with greater clarity. In particular, the term "together" is deleted and the term "sulfo" replaced with "$SO_3^-$." In Claims 14-15 and 21-22, "the total amount of formulas I to III is 100% by mass" is added to clarify the concentration ranges of the sulfoderivatives in the system.

Claims 7 and 19 are rewritten in independent form as suggested by the Examiner.

As the Examiner knows, a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if each and every limitation as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. To establish a proper *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, three criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the cited references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify or combine the cited reference relied upon by the Examiner to arrive at the claimed invention. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation that the suggested modification or combination would be successful. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest each and every limitation of the rejected claims. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed modification or combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based upon in the applicant's disclosure. M.P.E.P. §706.02. Applicants respectfully submit that Gvon *et al.* nether anticipate nor render the present invention obvious.

Instant Claim 1 recites a sulfoderivative compound comprising a sulfonated perylenetetracarboxylic acid dibenzimidazole (PTCA DBI) of formulas I to III. Claim 8 recites a lyotropic liquid crystal system comprising at least one sulfoderivative of Claim 1. Claim 17

recites an anisotropic film comprising at least one sulfoderivative of Claim 1. In formula I of Claim 1, at least one of the peripheral substituents of $X_1$ to $X_8$ is OH. Gvon *et al.* do not teach or suggest a sulfoderivative compound comprising a sulfonated PTCA DBI of formula I wherein at least one of the peripheral substituents of $X_1$ to $X_8$ is OH. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Gvon *et al.* do not anticipate or render Claims 1, 8 and 17 obvious and thus request reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 over Gvon *et al.*

Claims 2-6, 9-16, and 18-21 depend on Claim 1, 8 and 17 respectively. They are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as for Claims 1, 8 and 17.

## Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that Claims 1-26 are in condition for allowance. An early indication of the same is therefore respectfully requested. If any matters can be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below. No fees beyond those being submitted concurrently herewith are believed due.

Date: October 11, 2005

Respectfully submitted,
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

Tianjun Hou
Reg. No. 51,821

Customer No.: 32,940
Suite 1000
555 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94104-1513
Telephone: 650-857-1717